

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-18 and 22-36 are currently pending. Claim 35 has been added and is supported by at least original claim 1. Claims 1, 2, 17, 22, 23, and 29-34 have been amended and are supported by page 8, line 23, through page 9, line 16, and elsewhere in the original disclosure. Claim 36 has been added and is supported by page 6, lines 8-13, page 7, lines 4-6, and page 9, lines 11-16, of the original disclosure. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The specification was objected to for reciting the word “source.” In response, Applicant has reverted to reciting terminology from original claims 22 and 23. Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office remove its objections to the specification.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 28, 32, 33 were object to because they do not recite method steps. Although Applicant is aware a method may be draft to recited “steps of,” as far as Applicant knows, there is no requirement that the words “steps of” must be recited within a method. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office remove its objections to claims 28, 32, and 33.

### **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As claims 22 and 23 no longer recite “a source,” the rejection of these claims is moot.

### **35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a gateway” to provide antecedent basis for “gateway.”

Claim 2 has been amended to recite “by the at least first gateway.”

There is believed to be sufficient antecedent basis for “change the gateway” in claim 17 as its base claim 1 recites “change a gateway.”

Claims 29 and 34 has been amended to recite “comprising:” and amended in means plus function form.

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

### **35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections**

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-13, 15 and 17-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakemizu, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0018456, in view of Lee, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0085517.

Claim 1, in pertinent part, recites as follows:

an internal secured portion comprising a virtual private network certificate authority...

The other independent claims recite subject matter similar to that recited by claim 1 in that an internal secured portion comprises a virtual private network certificate authority.

Kakemizu discloses a virtual private network (VPN) that works in conjunction with a home authentication server. According to the second, third, fifth, and sixth exemplary embodiments (Figures 25, 26, 28, and 29 respectively) of Kakemizu a method to purportedly reconstruct a VPN when a mobile node moves is disclosed. In the second embodiment beginning at paragraph [0113] and ending at paragraph [0117] of Kakemizu, the VPN is purportedly reconstructed after the user sends a registration request. This registration request includes the address of the old foreign agent. Paragraph [0113] of Kakemizu is reproduced below for reference purposes.

In FIG. 25, when the MN 1 of the user has moved from the FA 21 to a new FA 21' within the same domain, a registration request message (Reg Req) that includes the address of the old FA 21 is transmitted as prescribed in the mobile IP path optimization draft (draft-ietf-mobileip-optim-09) ({circle over (1)}). The new FA 21' includes this registration request into an authentication request message (AMR) ({circle over (2)}), and transmits this authentication request message (AMR) to the local AAA server (AAAF) 23 within its own ISP 2. When the authentication request message (AMR) includes the old FA 21, the AAAF 23 extracts the VPN between the FA and the HA from the VPN information cache, and substitutes the address of the FA 21 with the address of the new FA 21'. Then, the AAAF 23 returns to the new FA 21' an authentication response message (AMA) that is added with a profile of the VPN to be set to the FA ({circle over (3)}).

As discussed in the last response, the address of the old foreign agent is not equivalent to a new care-of-address of the mobile node that is different from a first care-of-address.

Kakemizu does not teach or suggest “an internal secured portion comprising a virtual private network certificate authority.”

The Patent Office asserted in the last two lines on page 5 and the first three lines on page

6 of the February 17, 2009 Final Office Action as follows:

Kakemizu et al. do not disclose explicitly in response to a receipt from the mobile node of a new care-of-address that is different from a first care-of-address.

Lee et al. in the same field of endeavor teach in response to a receipt from the mobile node of a new care-of-address that is different from a first care-of-address ("*using a newly allocated COA*"; para. [0043]).

Lee discloses a handoff method in an IP telephony system where a gatekeeper supports handoff. Lee, in paragraph 0095, discloses as follows:

when it is detected that MT2 has been moved to a different subnet of the same zone, that is, when it is detected that MT1 has been moved to a different subnet and becomes MT2, MT2 is assigned a care of address (COA: a new IP) by the foreign agent (FA) of the corresponding subnet and is requested to be registered for the gatekeeper (step S128). Upon receipt of a request of registration, the gatekeeper performs a handoff routine using the 3PPR signaling, since the terminal changes its IP during the call (step S129).

Lee, like Kakemizu, does not teach or suggest "an internal secured portion comprising a virtual private network certificate authority."

Thus, claims 1-34 are patentable.

The Patent Office rejected claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakemizu and Lee, as applied to claims 1, 13, and 15 above, and further in view of Shapira, U.S. Patent No. 7,107,464.

Claims 14 and 16 have been rejected as obvious in regards to Kakemizu in view of Lee and Shapira. The Shapira reference fails to cure the shortcomings of Kakemizu and Lee. Claims 14 and 16 are both dependent on claims that should be allowed for reasons argued above, and therefore claims 14 and 16 should be allowed as well.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs, and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and to allow all of the pending claims as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of now pending claims 1-18 and 22-35 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski  
Walter J. Malinowski

April 16, 2009  
Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400, ext. 15

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: hsmith@hspatent.com

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

4/16/2009      Clair F. Man  
Date                      Name of Person Making Deposit